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Abstract
Pre-Colonial Caribbean communities participated in intensive interaction networks of human mobility and exchange of goods and ideas, guided by their cosmovision, technology, and socio-political organization. The urge to garner status, which reflected on the group and the individual, and the desire for access to a myriad of materials and products formed important motivations for articulating pre-Colonial interaction circuits. Through the adoption of a multi-disciplinary perspective, this paper seeks to develop a holistic view on the operation of interaction network(s) across a wide, socio-politically diverse region between 6000 BC and the early Colonial period. The adoption of a diachronic, macro-geographic perspective will help evaluate the structure through time of these social networks at archipelagic and pan-Caribbean scales.

Résumé
Guidées par leur vision du cosmos, leur technologie et leur organisation sociopolitique, les populations préhistoriques de la Caraïbe se sont inscrites dans des réseaux d’interaction de mobilité et d’échanges de biens et d’idées. Le besoin d’acquérir un statut reflétant l’identité communautaire et individuelle, ainsi que le désir d’accéder à une grande quantité de matériaux et de produits, ont constitué en soi des motivations importantes. Suivant une approche
Communities in interaction

The highly variegated pre-Colonial Caribbean (is)landscape, always had a dynamic, inter-connected character thanks to the maritime orientation of its native (Amerindian) inhabitants and the region-wide interaction networks they maintained. It is now commonly accepted that human islanders were never socially isolated except in very extreme cases, but rather that the sea likely functioned as an ‘aquatic motorway’, a plane that the islanders would have traversed frequently, despite its occasional unpredictability (e.g., Boomert and Bright 2007; Broodbank 2002; Fitzpatrick (ed.) 2004; Rainbird 2007). Seen from this perspective, the Caribbean Sea actually linked communities instead of separating them, encouraging (micro-)regional mobility and exchange (e.g., Berman and Gnivecki 1995; Hofman et al. 2007; Keegan and Diamond 1987; Watters and Rouse 1989). Indeed, the pre-Colonial peoples of continental regions of Central and South America, having learned the skill of seafaring, were able to move directly across the Caribbean Sea and between island passages as early as around 6000 BC (Callaghan 2001; Febles 1991; Wilson et al. 1998). The success of these early migrations and of later settlement and establishment of interaction networks undoubtedly depended greatly on the maintenance of contacts with the ‘homeland(s)’ and between communities throughout the region (Hofman et al. in press). These linkages or ‘lifelines’ would have acted as a safety net, crucial in times of environmental or social hazards, by ensuring that demographically unstable fledgling colonies would have sufficient access to suitable marriage partners (Keegan 2004; Kirch 2000; Moore 2001).

Upon first contact in 1492, the native inhabitants of the Caribbean astonished the Europeans with their voyaging skills and the elaborate interaction networks they maintained. Moreover, the Europeans were impressed by the high speed at which exchange objects were introduced into and circulated within these networks. As Chris-
topher Columbus noted in the diary of his first voyage, barely 72 hours after making landfall in the Americas:

“Monday, October 15 [...] and while I was between these two islands i.e., Santa Maria [Rum Cay] and this large one which I named Fernandina [Long Island], I met a man alone in a pirogue [canoe] going from the island of Santa María to Fernandina. He had with him a small loaf, the size of his fist, a gourd of water, some red earth ground into powder and made into paste, and some dried leaves, which these people must greatly prize, for they presented me some of it on San Salvador. He had also a basket made in their native fashion in which he had a small string of glass beads and two blancas [Spanish coins]. From these things I knew that he had come from the island of San Salvador, had touched Santa María, and was now going to Fernandina”.

Irving Rouse (1951, 1992), one of the founding fathers of Caribbean archaeology, advanced the perspective of interacting island communities as early as the 1950s. In positing that islands are not isolated contexts where cultures evolve without external influence, he defined several geo-cultural spaces (so-called passage areas) that acknowledged interaction between neighboring islands, yet envisaged little or no interactions with the adjacent continental regions after Ceramic Age settling with the exception of northeastern South America, the supposed Orinocan ‘homeland’ of neo-Indian Antillean cultures. Thus Rouse opposed the concept of a ‘Circum-Caribbean culture area’, which united the Caribbean and Intermediate culture areas in terms of parallel socio-political developments (Steward 1947).

Instead, following a specific framework of cultural taxonomy, cultural diffusion was envisioned as the outcome of population movement or migration, drawing on a combination of archaeological, linguistic and physical anthropological research. With the exception of some Lithic and Archaic Age peoples, the Caribbean archipelago was determined to have been settled from the mainland of South America in a phased, stepping-stone manner (see Curet 2005 for an extensive review of this issue). This perspective resulted in a diachronic focus on island settlement instead of a synchronic perspective on inter-community communication and exchange.

Various hypotheses were subsequently advanced to understand the motivations and mechanisms underlying migrations. Push and pull factors were invoked, with warfare and population pressure in the lands of origin on the one hand and the economic attractiveness of the insular territories on the other (Siegel 1991). Opportunism and flexibility were suggested to be inherent traits by which people were able to move into the Antilles through adaptation to the available resources. Recently, an Arawakan diaspora has been proposed (Heckenberger 2002). Migration in this sense is viewed as a unilinear event at the macro-scale of cultures or supra-cultures (known as series and subseries) and not traceable at the micro-scale of local groups identifiable by styles or complexes. Furthermore, the mental template of a sole origin for Ceramic Age island populations in northeastern South America still constrained these contributions, leaving potential macro-regional connections with other
neighboring continental areas like coastal Central America, Colombia and western Venezuela unconsidered (Rodríguez Ramos and Pagán Jiménez 2006; Wilson 2007).

**Shifting paradigms**

Recently, a multi-linear, reticulate model for island settlement and communication networks has been proposed that departs from the traditional unilinear view of migration (Callaghan 2003; Keegan 2004; Hofman et al. 2007, Fitzpatrick 2009; Rodríguez Ramos 2007). In addition, the paradigm has shifted away from establishing cultural frameworks and pinpointing migration events and large population movements towards analysing the processes underlying human mobility and material culture distributions (e.g., Boomert 2000; Hofman et al. 2007; Keegan and Maclachlan 1989) as well as focusing on social organisation to explain culture changes and shifting interaction spheres (e.g., Crock and Petersen 2004; Curet and Oliver 1998; Hofman and Hoogland 2004; Siegel 1999). In this perspective migration is regarded primarily as a continuous process of mobility involving, amongst others, exploratory expeditions, small-scale movement of local groups and colonization from various parts of continental America (Rodriguez Ramos 2007; Ulloa Hung and Valcárcel Rojas 2002), activity-driven or seasonal mobility and movement between communities triggered by marriage alliances, feasting, and enmity. Taken together, these multi-scalar forms of mobility give rise to complex networks within which people move, circulate, and exchange goods and ideas. Exchange can thus be regarded as the reciprocal movement of (im)material goods through human interaction embedded in a complex web of symbiotic social relationships and meanings (Hofman et al. 2007). Apart from ensuring demographic fitness, permitting access to a range of basic needs and promoting the formation and maintenance of socio-political alliances through marriage and ritual services, exchange is a form of communication. The exchange of utilitarian wares and socially valued goods would for instance frequently be accompanied by the sharing of myths, tales, songs, dances, ritual knowledge and experience, embedded in native cosmovision. Seen in this light, we would fully expect the maintaining of ‘symbiotic relationships’, initially between Archaic and Ceramic Age communities and later between Ceramic Age communities originating from the disparate areas facing the Caribbean Sea.

**A pan-Caribbean perspective**

Such a new paradigm necessitates the re-evaluation of the trans-Caribbean vectors of interaction from a multi-scalar perspective. Archaeological evidence suggests that we need to view the wider Caribbean or circum-Caribbean region as potentially one large arena within which Amerindians could have established and maintained local and regional circuits of mobility and exchange as they traversed water passages and islands, without downplaying their cultural, social, biological, or linguistic particularities. This pan-Caribbean approach demands a pan-regional, diachronic, multi-scalar and cross-culturally comparative perspective on mobility and exchange between manifold communities with varying forms of socio-political organisation. In the following examples focus will be laid on the diachronic social dynamics and mechanisms at play throughout the larger arena of the Caribbean Sea. This is not to downplay the importance of the synchronic developments at the local scale of the community but rather to highlight the overarching setting in which local communities (inter) acted, forming variably interlocking larger
and smaller networks of mobility and exchange.

**Archaeological lines of evidence**

Increasingly in the last few years, evidence has surfaced for a myriad of regional interactions between the Antilles and continental America (see also Figure 1). Contact lines between the Antilles, Colombia, and Central America (Harlow et al. 2006, but see García-Casco et al. 2009 for counter arguments; Newsom and Wing 2004; Rodríguez Ramos 2007), exchanges between the Antilles and lower Central America (Rodríguez Ramos 2007; Sued-Badillo 1979), links between Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic and Cuba on the one hand and Colombia on the other (Cooper et al. 2008; Rodríguez Ramos and Pagán Jiménez 2006; Siegel and Severin 1993; Valcárcel Rojas and Rodríguez 2003), connections between the Antilles, the southern Caribbean islands and lower Central America (Rodriguez Ramos 2007; Veloz Maggiolo and Angulo Valdez 1982; Versteeg 1999) and between the southern Caribbean islands and the hinterland of central Venezuela (Antczak 1998) have all recently been advanced. These interactions also include those between the Antilles and northeastern South America and between the Greater and Lesser Antilles that were established at an earlier stage (e.g., Allaire 1999; Boomert 2000; Curet 2005; Helms 1987; Hofman and Hoogland 2004; Keegan and Maclachlan 1989; Versteeg 1999; Watters and Scaglion 1994; Zucchi 1991). While these specific studies have provided positive evidence of contacts between various areas across the Caribbean.

Figure 1. The dynamics of mobility and exchange at play across the Caribbean Sea during precolonial and early Colonial times illustrating the diversity of interaction networks active at multiple scales (object photographs courtesy of Roberto Valcárcel Rojas, Alice Samson, Alistair Bright, Arie Boomert, Menno Hoogland, map drafted by Menno Hoogland and Alistair Bright after an original by Corinne Hofman).
Sea, they almost exclusively provide evidence for a one-way traffic into the insular Caribbean. As such, the available data are in many cases too fragmentary and limited in scope to unravel the intricacies of human mobility, regional communication networks and the reciprocal mechanisms underlying them. Joint consideration of detailed studies of non-local signatures in human skeletal remains, provenancing of source areas and raw materials as well as the study of shared iconographic themes has the potential to furnish a more comprehensive, well-founded framework of mobility and exchange throughout the circum-Caribbean and possibly, pan-Caribbean exchanges. This potential will now be highlighted through the examination of a number of case studies within the realm of the three research themes mentioned above.

Biogeochemical analysis of human skeletal remains

In recent decades the development of various biogeochemical methods has allowed inferring patterns of mobility and migration from the archaeological record. Recent studies of ancient-DNA and of morphological traits of human skeletal remains from the Caribbean have proved that migratory movements took place from mainland South America into the Antillean archipelago and from northwestern Venezuela into the southern Caribbean islands, as evidenced by a study on recent DNA on Aruba (Lalueza-Fox et al. 2003; Torolabrador 2003). However, genetic research has yet to be refined so as to either include or rule out other areas of origin of the island populations such as Central America. More recently, studies of strontium isotopes have also proved to be successful in determining past movements, geographic origins and cultural affinity (Booden et al. 2008). Results from biogeochemical analysis combined with demographic data as well as information on mortuary practices, palaeopathology, distribution of mortuary practices, (for example the spread of the Treponema bacteria), health conditions and diet provide a solid base for the interpretation of social relationships and mobility throughout the region.

Strontium isotopes vary regionally according to a limited number of factors and as strontium can often be found in a variety of archaeological materials such as human, faunal, and plant remains this approach has widespread utility. A database is currently being created with local signatures obtained from plant, faunal and geological samples in order to establish a baseline for the measurements of the human remains from assemblages across the Caribbean (Laffoon and Hoogland 2009). The Caribbean coast of Central America remains a blank spot as not many skeletal assemblages are available from that area to date.

Strontium isotope analysis carried out on skeletal remains from the archaeological site of Anse à la Gourde (AAG), located on the limestone island of Grande Terre, Guadeloupe, has revealed that at least one fourth of the population was non-local. The site was inhabited between AD 500 and 1400, but the major occupation concentrates between AD 1000 and 1400. Thus far 24 round and oval house structures have been documented surrounded by an oval shaped midden (Hofman et al. 2001; Morsink 2006). The houses vary between eight and twelve meters in diameter and the habitation area also served as a burial ground. Eighty-three burials containing 103 individuals have been found in and around the houses, suggesting the repeated interment of ancestors close to and among the living. Burials occur in clusters and mortuary practices are varied and complex. The majority of the burials was inhumed in a flexed position, which is characteristic of Late Ceramic Age burial assemblages. Ma-
Manipulation of the bones after decomposition of the weak parts indicates that the graves were left open after interment of the dead persons and emphasized the role ancestors played in day-to-day social life (Hoogland et al. 1999).

The strontium values of 28% of the AAG individuals do not match the values of the island of Grande Terre, indicating that they spent their childhood in another island (Hoogland and Hofman 2010). On the basis of their strontium isotope heterogeneity, it is unlikely that they represent one single group of migrants. The non-local individuals, randomly distributed over the habitation area, mainly consist of females. This trend may be indicative of a preference for virilocal residence. It is noteworthy that tools and ornaments manufactured from non-local materials (greenstone and calci-rudite from St. Martin and flint from Antigua) were only found in the grave inventory of non-local females. One of the female burials was found with more than 1000 shell beads on her pelvis. The beads were manufactured from *Eustrombus gigas* shell, but as no production debris was found at the site, it is assumed that the beads were also imported from another place. The unique occurrence of non-local females buried with non-local grave goods may offer a rare insight into direct transmission, i.e., the transporting of material culture directly by the people concerned as opposed to a down-the-line exchange of goods.

Provenancing source areas and raw materials

The varied geological make-up of the circum-Caribbean region means that the distribution of various natural resources, such as lithics, clays, pottery temper materials, shell, fiber and wood differs from island to island and between the various continental regions. Over the past decades, archaeometric research (e.g., X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF), X-Ray Diffraction (XRD), Inductively coupled plasma Mass Spectrometry (ICP-MS) and Instrumental Neutron Activation Analysis (INAA) has positively identified the provenance areas of a number of pre-Colonial artifacts from the Caribbean (e.g., Descantes et al. (eds) 2008; Fitzpatrick et al. 2009a; Harlow et al. 2006; Knippenberg 2006; see Hofman et al. 2008 for a summary).

This research implies that raw materials and finished products circulated within a vast network, underpinned by direct procurement at the source but also by extensive exchange of semi-finished or finished objects. In a number of cases we may also assume that the communities who had access to certain raw materials became specialized in the manufacture of certain goods over others, as has been ethnographically documented among many lowland South-American groups (cf. Butt Colson 1973). Also, as on the continent, social mechanisms aimed at maintaining relationships between communities must have been an important factor in the exchange of goods.

There is ample evidence that exchange of various materials occurred within the archipelago and also between the Greater and Lesser Antilles at different points in time. We also have confirmation that ceramics, lithics and *guanin* (gold-copper alloy) objects as well as tools and ornaments of coral, shell and bone reached the islands from continental America and vice versa (Boomert 2000; Cooper et al. 2008; Rodríguez Ramos 2007). There are examples of ornaments made of armadillo, opossum, deer and jaguar bone, there are shell objects of the Unionidae family (a fresh water mollusk possibly endemic to the riverine environments of mainland Venezuela) and a large number of exotic beads and pendants are found on the islands made
of semi-precious stones (agate, amber, amethyst, aventurine, barite, carnelian, malachite, nephrite, and olivine among others) not indigenous to these islands (Boomer 2000; Fitzpatrick et al. 2009b; Grouard 2001; Serrand 2001). In the same vein there is evidence that *Eustrombus gigas* shells (*botutos*) from the southern Caribbean islands were transported to the hinterland of central Venezuela to be exchanged with inland communities (Antczak 1998).

Initially, X-Ray diffraction analysis of (fragments of) jadeite axes or adzes from the Lesser Antilles suggested that either the raw material itself or objects manufactured from this material were transported from Central America (i.e., Guatemala) into the islands (Harlow, et al. 2006). However, the recent discovery of jadeite sources in Cuba and Hispaniola decreases the likelihood of a Central American connection and rather points to a Greater Antillean origin (i.e., García Casco et al. 2009; Rojas, this issue). Similar adzes have been found throughout the Greater and Lesser Antilles both during the Early and Late Ceramic Ages suggesting that a vast network existed in which these objects circulated.

Petrographic analysis also positively identified Guyanese affiliation of the Cayo ceramics in the Windward Islands of the Lesser Antilles. Additional confirmation of the South American origin of this pottery is found in its stylistic affiliations to Koriabo ceramics of that area of the mainland and in part of it being tempered with caraipe, the burned bark of the South American ‘kwepi’ tree (*Licania* sp.), which does not occur on the islands. Cayo pottery in the Windward Islands is dated to the late pre-Colonial and early Colonial periods and has been found from Grenada to Basse Terre, Guadeloupe. Cayo pottery has been correlated with the so-called Kallinango or Island Carib, whose presence in the southwestern portion of the Lesser Antilles during the Late Ceramic Age is debated, though they are certainly firmly established by the early Colonial period, as described in the ethnohistorical sources (Allaire 1984; Boomer 1986).

A last case-study concerns XRF analysis on a number of gold and *guanin* objects from the Greater Antilles. Fragments of hammered ornaments made of a gold (placer gold) and pendants made of a gold-copper alloy or *guanin* are known from Puerto Rico and Vieques from Saladoid times onwards and from the Dominican Republic and Cuba from the Late Ceramic Age (see Cooper et al. 2008). Combined archaeometric and iconographic analysis confirmed the origin of some of the *guanin* pieces on the South American mainland (Colombia) and they probably reached the Greater Antilles via Central America. Two main areas of origin have been pinpointed for the Cuban *guanin* in Colombia, namely Tairona and Zenu. A similar piece is known from the Mazaruni river area in Guyana (Whitehead 1990) which suggests that trade of these objects also took place along the coast or the rivers of northern South America.

It is very likely that the Spanish continued the trade in *guanin* gold with the Colombian ateliers during the early Colonial period. This is best evidenced from the contact site of Chorro de Maíta in Cuba (AD 1400-1600) excavated by Cuban archaeologists during the 1980s and currently being analyzed by Roberto Valcárcel Rojas. Numerous ornaments as well as European brass objects have been found at the site buried as grave goods among the 120 individuals (Cooper et al. 2008; Valcárcel Rojas and Rodriguez Arce 2005).

*Iconographic analysis of shared themes and ideas*

A number of iconographic themes are
also clearly shared between the islands and continental America, pointing to the recursive flow of ideas across the region. The circum-Caribbean Amerindian world revolved around the circulation of goods and ideas, from the distribution of raw materials, preforms and finished products to the spread of ideas and social valuables \(^{10}\) by means of exchange and/or gift-giving. Specific pottery objects and items made of guanin, semi-precious stones and other rock materials, shell, coral, bone and wood, were imbued with multiple meanings that extended beyond their function. Social valuables continued to accrue symbolic and codified connotations upon entering networks of interaction as items of exchange and communication sometimes becoming heirlooms over time (Hofman et al. 2008; Fitzpatrick et al. 2009a). These meanings and associations all derived from the natural and cultural surroundings, ultimately encompassed in Amerindian cosmovision, and expressed in oral traditions transmitted through stories, tales, songs and dances.

The following cases point to such a recursive relationship between material culture and cosmovision. Exotic lithic materials with non-insular iconographic representations associated with the Huecoid/Huecan Saladoid ceramics in Puerto Rico and the northern Lesser Antilles have been ascribed a Costa Rican and Panamanian origin (Rodríguez Ramos and Pagan-Jiménez 2006; see also Rodríguez Ramos this issue). On the other hand, greenstone frog-shaped pendants (known as Muiraquitã in Brazil) and other exotic rock materials point to connections with the tropical lowlands of South America (Boomert 1987). Furthermore, the mainland iconography of jaguars, king vultures, peccaries and caimans on insular Saladoid ceramics, microlapidary work, and ceremonial paraphernalia underscores the continuing affiliations with the South American mainland, or at least the endurance of a mental template of the homeland environment (Boomert 2003; Hofman et al. in press; Roe 1989).

During the Late Ceramic Age, there is a sudden appearance of female figurines or statue(tte)s in Suazan Troumassoid assemblages throughout the southern Lesser Antilles. Petitjean Roget suggests that their appearance denotes a realignment of society and potentially traces the roots of this phenomenon back to the late Saladoid (Petitjean Roget 1993, 2005). However, it is more likely that the phenomenon is connected to that of the sitting or standing female figurines that feature so prominently in the Late Ceramic Age Marajoaroid (Roosevelt 1991), Arauquinoid (Rostain and Versteeg 2004) and Valencioid (Antczak and Antczak 2006) series that feature across large swaths of coastal north-eastern South America.

Although these examples are likely just the tip of the iceberg, research in this field is the least developed of the three avenues discussed above, and much work remains to be done, particularly in the realms of comparing material culture assemblages throughout the circum-Caribbean, comparative mythology and materiality.

**Discussion**

In this paper we have explored different strands of multi-disciplinary research that can be fruitfully drawn together to explore the circum-Caribbean as a meaningful entity, whose inhabitants constructed social and trade networks by maintaining extensive circuits of mobility and exchange. Evidently, over a period of some 6000 years the Caribbean islands witnessed a continual coming and going (i.e., to-ing and fro-ing; sensu Hofman et al. 2007) of a differentiated flux of populations with a high degree of mobility, with a range of motives, and with various origins and destinations. In time, people, perishable and non-perishable
goods, ideas and information as well as cultural and social practices from numerous ‘homeland(s)’ amalgamated. This led to a growing number of local communities of heterogeneous composition and the ultimate diversification within the archipelago in late pre-Colonial times, amounting to what has been called a ‘mosaic of cultures’ (Wilson 1993). The plurality of this region, mirrored in today’s societies, had initially been downplayed by the adoption of an uni-linear approach, raising the spectre of a non-dynamic or rather slow-moving migratory pattern that runs counter to everything we know of how these societies live in continental America (Hofman and Carlin 2010). Goods, ideas, and cultural and linguistic traits were most likely exchanged through the Caribbean islands at a high speed. Boundaries and alliances were doubtlessly being constantly shifted and negotiated, adopted and rejected. More extensive research into the archaeological and anthropological reflection of cultural interactions should allow the identification of many more contact lines, and the contextualisation of such nodes as to their position within an overarching pan-Caribbean network system, or within the various larger and smaller interaction spheres that constitute it.
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1. “[...] y estando a medio golpho d’estas dos islas, es de saber, de aquella Sancta Maria y d’esta grande a la cual pongo nombre la Fernandina, hallé un hombre solo en una almadía que se pasaba de la isla de Sancta Maria a la Fernandina, y tráia un poco de su pan, que seria tanto como el puño y una calabaza de agua, y un pedazo de tierra bermeja hecha en polvo y después amasada, y unas hojas secas, que debe ser cosa muy apreciada entrellos, porque ya me truxieron en San Salvador d’ellas en presente; y tráia un cestillo a su guisa en que tenía un ramalejo de cuentezillas de vidrió y dos blancas, por las cuales conocí qu’él venía de la isla de San Salvador, y avía pasado a aquélla de Sancta Maria y se pasaba a la Fernandina” (Columbus 1992(1):55, according to Las Casas).
2. The Caribbean culture area includes eastern Venezuela, the coasts of the Guianas, and the Antilles. The Intermediate area encompasses the coastal areas of Central America, west Venezuela and the islands offshore its coast such as the Dutch Caribbean Islands (see Rodríguez Ramos, this volume). Steward’s framework was adopted by Meggers and the group of ‘social archaeologists’. See Fonseca 1988; Meggers 1979; Vargas Arenas and Sanoja 1999; Veloz Maggiolo 1980.
3. Research in this line was also carried out under the auspices of Hofman and Bright within the Netherlands Foundation for Scientific Research (NWO)-funded ASPASIA project ‘Socio-political complexity in the pre-Columbian Caribbean: an integral approach to inter-insular and inter-regional relationships’.
4. Recently Archaic Age sites in the Greater Antilles have yielded evidence of pottery making independent of the later ceramic tradition known as Saladoid, which has traditionally been interpreted as the earliest pottery of the region introduced by the alleged first ceramic-producing migrants from northern South America (Rímoli and Nadal 1983; Rodríguez Ramos et al. 2008; Veloz Maggiolo 1974).
5. For different types of mobility, see e.g., Bellwood 2004; Curet 2005; Hofman et al. 2006; Kelly 1995; Manning 2005; Moch 2003; Moore 2001; Sellet et al. (eds) 2006.
6. This definition of exchange has been adapted from Boomert 2000 and Arvelo-Jiménez and Biord 1994.
7. See Nassaney and Sassaman (eds) 1995 for a multi-scalar approach to the archaeology of the American Southeast.
9. Although there is some preliminary data about central and western Cuban populations being related to Central America (Schurr and Sherry 2006).
10. See Mol 2007 for this adaptation of the concepts of socially valued goods (Spielmann 2002), social goods (Siegel pers. comm.) and primitive valuables (Earle and Ericson 1977).
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